

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is requested.

In the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment attached to the Advisory Action dated March 10, 2004, the Patent and Trademark Office noted that claim 22 had an incorrect status identifier. A correction has been made indicating the proper status identifier for claim 22. This response includes a complete listing of claims showing the amendments made in Applicant's response filed on February 20, 2004. Claims 1-3, and 5-22 remain pending in the application.

In the previously filed response dated February 20, 2004, Applicant argued that the Final Office Action dated December 30, 2003 was improperly issued. In the Advisory Action dated March 10, 2004, the Examiner failed to even recognize such arguments. Since the December 30, 2003 Final Office Action was improperly issued, issuance of the March 10, 2004 Advisory Action is erroneous and without merit.

Furthermore, in the March 10, 2004 Advisory Action, the Examiner refused to enter Applicant's February 20, 2004 amendment and response and alleged that Applicant's amendment to claims 1, 10, 16, 21 and 22 add new matter and requires further consideration and/or search. The Examiner is mistaken. The amendments made to such claims include the subject matter of dependent claim 4 which the Applicant argued includes patentable subject matter. For example, claims 1, 16, 21, and 22 were amended to include the subject matter of dependent claim 4, amendments to claim 10 includes the subject matter of claims 4 and 5. This is further proof that the Advisory Action was erroneously issued. Therefore, Applicant's February 20, 2004 response should have been entered and considered by the Examiner.

In the interest of enhancing the prosecution of this case, Applicant has filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and requests that the claims and arguments presented in the February 20, 2004 response be considered for substantive examination.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview before issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

William K. Meade II, et al., Inventors

Date: March 30, 2004

By:

K. Satheesh Karra

Satheesh K. Karra

Reg. No. 40,246

Keith D. Grzelak

Reg. No. 37,144

March 30, 2004
(509) 624-4276